

pétitions dont la plupart auraient pu être évitées. Par ailleurs, la traduction française (l'ouvrage fut rédigé d'abord en roumain), excellente dans son ensemble, comporte quelques termes impropres, de même que certains titres d'ouvrages grecs ont été traduits de façon maladroite. Enfin, nous avons déjà dit qu'il arrive parfois à l'auteur d'ignorer la bibliographie la plus récente sur des questions particulières. Mais ces quelques réflexions et remarques n'enlèvent rien à la valeur, à la très grande valeur, de cette étude volumineuse et érudite.

ASTERIOS ARGYRIOU

Sorin Alexandrescu, ed., *Transformational Grammar and the Rumanian Language*, Lisse 1977, pp. 97.

Professor Alexandrescu, of the University of Amsterdam, and editor of the prestigious *International Journal of Rumanian Studies*, has put together a novel and interesting collection, which, slim as it is, represents a collective international effort (American, French, German, Italian, and Romanian scholars) and a diversity of approaches (cf. p. 9), e.g., philosophical (S. Golopenția-Eretescu and E. Vasiliu), Prague School (J. Goudet, cf. pp. 8-9), etc. — thus belying the title — even including one contribution (H. Frisch) which has no discernible link AT ALL with Transformational Grammar.

J. Augerot's introduction (5-15) is a succinct presentation of the appeal Romanian holds for linguists (its conservatism as well as its innovative nature, etc.), followed by a chronological summary of the development of Transformational Grammar in Romania, plus a lengthy bibliography (1961-1974), unfortunately marred by numerous discrepancies (in abbreviations, dates, pages, titles).

H. Frisch (39-44), in attempting to predict feminine noun plural forms, resorts to lists (taxonomies of another era!), without, it seems to me, availing himself of techniques so as to give some account of deep structure forms and the rewrite rules necessary for deriving a confusion of surface forms. While S. Golopenția-Eretescu (45-57) makes reference to Fillmore and Chomsky, and to various transforms (e.g., coordination, gerundivization, etc., 52), as well as to the notion "well-formed" (even if overly used, e.g., three times in the space of seven lines, 47), her approach strikes one as being as much philosophical (von Wright, Wittgenstein) and quasi-algebraic (LA as the "language of action", LC that of "change", and so forth) as linguistic. In his lucid (though highly repetitious) article, J. Goudet (59-73) treats the use of the gerund (present participle) as an indicator of continuation in periphrastic constructions, three of which, according to him, serve as present presumptives; I remain unconvinced of the uniqueness (65-66) of the Romanian gerund, given similar uses in Spanish, for example. H. Krenn (75-82) describes a deletion rule for dropping the possessive article (i.e., after the definite article), while suggesting himself an insertion rule at the surface level: my own intuition would still favor the former, though not necessarily the proofs adduced (the deletion of *pe*) in E. Vasiliu and S. Golopenția-Eretescu, *Sintaxa transformatională a limbii române*, Bucharest: 1969. L. Renzi (83-88) compares the postposed Romanian article with the preposed articles of various other Romance languages, attempting to account for the difference on the basis of such factors as loss of case, subject-verb-object word order, genitive, phrase follows, etc.; in the question of preposition before (non)-articulated noun (cf. above) he does not seem to take into account instances where the article is obligatory (e.g., *cu avionul, la anul, datorită fratelui*, etc.). E. Vasiliu's work (89-97) on adversative and concessive clauses falls within the framework of set theory and Montague grammar, a further indication

of his growing preoccupation with what lies beyond (behind?) Linguistics (cf. 8).

In my estimation, however, the most interesting (and "Transformational") piece is that of R. Bley-Vroman (17-37), who deals with underlying parallels between the definite article and the personal pronoun system, including parts of the verb *a fi*. But despite the elegance and forcefulness of the argumentation—not to mention the overwhelmingly optimistic, at times effusive, presentation — I still find discomfiting the inclusion of the data amenable to the author's approach, while other artifacts are passed over quickly, if mentioned at all; e.g., the subject pronouns *eu* and *tu*, the indirect object forms *fi* and *le*, and all the enclitics. The possessive article *al*, *a*, *ai*, *ale* also merits inclusion.

Even accepting Bley-Vroman's disclaimer (33), his partial account of the alternations *t~f* and *s~ș* will do little to explain the alternation in *sie~șie* (33) or the lack of change "before front vowels" in *tine*, *sine*.

Finally, for all the ingenuity of the argument, I find particularly suspect the derivation of *e* (/ye/) from the ending of *este* (36), both on historical (Rom. *e* < Latin *est*; -e of *este* is paragogic) and descriptive grounds, especially as the author does not seem to account for still two other variants, enclitic -i and *fi* (with the "Vocală de Sprijin" which he cites elsewhere, 32, 35, in another connection). Surely, these are variants of *e*, I suspect by apocope, hence /y/ < /ye/, and then by prothesis, /iy/ < /y/. Bley-Vroman's acceptance of /est-l-i/ (36) as the underlying representation of the *second* person singular is further proof, it seems to me, that *e* is to be related not to the ending, but to the stem, of *este*.

Despite my numerous objections and reservations as to procedure and conclusions, the volume is appreciated, though perhaps as much as one more attestation OF INTEREST on the part of Western scholars, for the most part, thinking in new ways about Romanian, as for its contribution to linguistic theory and practice, in this case uneven and, by definition, incomplete.

University of Rochester

CHARLES M. CARLTON

Constantin Bușe, *Comertul exterior prin Galati sub regimul de port franc (1837-1883)* [Le commerce extérieur par Galatzi sous le régime de port franc - 1837-1883], București, 1976, Editua Academiei R.S.R., 202 p.

Récemment distingué avec le prix de l'Académie Roumaine, le livre de Constantin Bușe traite d'une question regardant l'histoire économique des Pays roumains, qu'il place dans le contexte sud-est européen, sans négliger les implications de la "Question d'Orient" pour le commerce international. Comme l'auteur le relève dans son chapitre introductif, les ouvrages de référence à ce sujet ne sont guère nombreux, d'où l'obligation d'entreprendre de longues recherches d'archive, son argumentation reposant sur quantité de documents inédits.

Compte tenu des événements politiques qui marquèrent l'évolution historique des Pays roumains à l'époque concernée, le livre se divise en deux parties de plusieurs chapitres chacune.

La première partie est consacrée à "Galatzi, port de Moldavie (1837-1861)". Après l'historique sommaire de la ville (que les documents attestent depuis l'an 1445), l'auteur nous donne un aperçu des circonstances dans lesquelles se développait à la fin du XVIIIe et au commencement du XIXe siècle le commerce roumain avec l'étranger. On y trouve étudiées les causes profondes qui ont conduit en 1834-1837 à faire de Galatzi un port franc, ainsi que les conséquences immédiates de cette mesure, c'est-à-dire l'épanouissement économique de la